

A justice framework to increase understanding of perceptions of fairness in environmental decision-making

Catherine Gross
PhD Scholar
The Fenner School of Environment & Society
The Australian National University,
Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia
E-Mail: Catherine.Gross@anu.edu.au

FIRST DRAFT ONLY -- NOT FOR CITATION OR QUOTATION

Paper prepared for the Amsterdam conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change "*Earth System Governance: Theories and Strategies for Sustainability*" May 24-26, 2007, Amsterdam

Abstract

Conflicts or disagreements within communities have become commonplace where decisions concerning the allocation of natural resources must be made. Institutions responsible for governance and environmental decision-making frequently struggle to gain broad community and stakeholder approval for proposals concerning natural resources such as water allocation or the siting of wind farms. At the centre of such complex problems are issues of equity and justice. Although there is a substantial body of research and theory on justice much of this has been in the abstract or external to a social context. The lack of contextually applied justice research is recognized as a significant gap in environmental resource allocation research. Theories and constructs from multiple disciplines can be used to unravel the tangle of issues embedded within social problems. This paper outlines one such transdisciplinary research approach and provides an overview of its first application in the understanding of a real-life social conflict.

1. Introduction

Perceptions and beliefs about sharing, fairness and a just social order have been discussed for millennia. Yet still the allocation and sharing of natural resources remains a societal problem. Both in theory and in practice these topics can generate intense debate from the breakfast table to the boardroom. Conflicts and disagreements within communities and between stakeholders and decision-makers have become commonplace where decisions concerning natural resources such as wind power or water are made. At the heart of these conflicts are complex problems involving issues of equity and justice. Such social problems are by their nature unique within a local context, each with its own set of socio-cultural norms, usage patterns, procedures and rules. Who is entitled to a particular natural resource through what type of access mechanism is frequently subject to a complex set of changing rules and decision-making procedures.

Water reform in Australia is one such area which has taken centre stage as a lengthy and severe drought has brought the threat of serious hardship to rural communities. Australia is a dry country. It is broadly agreed that water in Australia has been over-allocated and environmental degradation has been one result (Cullen, 2002). It is accepted that socio-economic changes are inevitable and awareness is growing that reforms are likely to be perceived as inequitable. Therefore calls have been made for communities to be included in decision-making processes and for justice issues to be included in social research and policy analysis (Schofield *et al.*, 2003; Hussey, 2007). Syme and Nancarrow (2005), long-time social justice researchers in Australia, argue that justice and fairness are important components of decision-making processes that can result in greater acceptance of outcomes. Biermann (2007:9), in his call for research into 'earth system governance', suggests that allocation mechanisms that are "perceived as fair and equitable by all stakeholders" is a key research challenge. He suggests that research methodologies should be integrative and reflect social reality and are best based on approaches which are "qualitative, case based, context dependent, and reflexive" (Biermann, 2007:3).

The research described in this paper is a response to these calls and is the first part of a larger body of research. The overall problem addressed by this research is that of how to allocate natural resources between stakeholders. The primary challenge is to devise competent decision-making processes in allocation systems in which both the process and outcome can be perceived as fair. A first step in meeting this challenge is to study a complex social problem concerning an allocation decision which was perceived to be unjust, in this case, the allocation of water for irrigated farming. The aim here is to explore individual's perceptions of the decision-making process and outcome. The outcomes of this research can then inform and improve allocation mechanisms. The second challenge is to devise a research method through which this understanding can be gained.

There are three aims which set the research in the direction of these challenges. The first is to investigate the idea of fairness within a real-life complex social problem. The second is to explore the use of an empirical analytical framework in order to achieve the first aim. The third is to show how the use of such a framework can contribute to justice discourse. This paper addresses these three aims within the context of the two research challenges described above. From this point on the paper deals solely with the question of satisfying these three aims.

For the first aim, investigating a real-life social problem, a case study approach has been chosen. The case study is a small rural community in Australia which depends

entirely upon irrigation water for its social and economic well-being. In October 2006 decision-making authorities unexpectedly cut the water allocation during an extended period of drought taking irrigators by surprise and precipitating a protest attended by over two thousand people. This case study was chosen for two reasons. First it was clear from the large numbers of protesters that there was a current and important issue to be investigated. The second reason was that the protest was concerned with a natural resource allocation decision which made it a good subject for justice research. The research focuses on individual perceptions of the decision and the consequences of the decision on the community: it is not about community consultation or water allocation *per se*.

2. Research design

2.1 A holistic and adaptive research methodology

Understanding complex societal problems requires a research methodology that is holistic and adaptable. A holistic approach recognizes that there are linkages between biophysical and social systems. Integrative research, human ecology and transdisciplinary research are such holistic approaches which transcend disciplinary boundaries (Dovers, 2005; Berkes and Folke, 1998; Pohl, 2005). Transdisciplinary research is gaining acceptance as a research approach that can transcend individual disciplines to gain multiple perspectives that could not be achieved within a single discipline (Wickson *et al.*, 2006). Pohl (2005:1160) describes transdisciplinary research as searching "for a viewpoint that lies between, or beyond, disciplines" and that takes "knowledge which is produced and organised in accordance with a particular discipline and rearrange[s] it so as to make it useful and meaningful for socially relevant issues". However, these definitions seem to imply that the disciplines are still the organizers and keepers of knowledge. Brown (in press) identifies five sources of knowledge (individual knowledge, local community knowledge, specialised knowledge, strategic knowledge and holistic knowledge) and argues that it is the interactions and syntheses between these sources that can contribute to a collective understanding of a complex issue.

The research methodology developed in this paper draws on these approaches to provide an overall holistic framework for the research. Sources of knowledge drawn upon include justice theory (Section 2.3), the historical context (Sections 3.2 and 3.3), current institutional arrangements (Section 3.4) and findings from the local community itself (Section 4). The research seeks patterns of interactions (see Berkes and Folke, 1998) between the societal arrangements, communities, institutions and biophysical systems to shed light on the societal problem at the centre of the study.

Within this transdisciplinary research approach, the theoretical and empirical components of the research can be interwoven in a way that is best described by Layder's (1998:37) "adaptive theory". Here the actual process of the research is a continuous cycling between the theoretical aspects of the research and the empirical findings, with each cycle or rotation resulting in new explorations, connections and discoveries in each area. In this research the theoretical stage preceded the empirical part of the research. The analytical framework has been extended from an earlier framework used to investigate community perspectives of a proposed wind farm development. In that research a community fairness framework—itsself an adaptive research outcome—was developed from the theoretical constructs and empirical data (Gross, 2007).

2.2 The research method

An important aspect of transdisciplinary research is the recognition and acceptance that this type of research is breaking new ground and does not have the comfort of

established research methods typically found within the disciplines (Wickson *et al.*, 2006). Research methods appropriate for the situation must therefore be devised. These will be dependent on both the context and on the angle taken by the researcher, which in this research is a justice perspective. The research approach must be capable of teasing out the core elements from the compound problem. However, the discomfort of working outside disciplinary boundaries and their well-established and accepted research methods must not be overlooked (see Braud and Anderson, 1998). For example, the qualitative-quantitative divide still exists (Dovers, 2005), and research which uses case study and qualitative approaches can still be challenged on the grounds of lack of precision and rigour (Yin, 2003). Despite these ongoing research challenges, the research design must address the research problem while recognizing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the methods chosen.

The research methods literature offers categories of the different types of research and appropriate methods for each different type (Braud and Anderson, 1998). 'What and why' questions are typically described as exploratory where little is known about the situation, in which case a qualitative approach, such as an interview, would be an appropriate first research method (Braud and Anderson, 1998). In this research the first aim is to investigate the Denilquin protest and the impact of the water allocation decision on the community. Central research questions are "What was the central issue of the protest? Why were people motivated to attend the protest? What were the perceived effects of the decision on the community?" A semi-structured interview approach with key informant members of the community was therefore chosen as the method which would be most likely to draw out the underlying reasons for the social unrest and associated themes (Lewis, 2003). An empirical analytical framework was developed (see Section 2.4) in which the interview questions were based on constructs drawn from justice and social psychology theories (described in the next section), and from information sourced from the media and other areas. The framework was designed to provide a consistent question structure and sequence for all interviews.

2.3 Theories of justice and the psychology of justice

Much of the debate on concepts of justice has been concerned with individual rights, social justice, the welfare of society at large and how material goods should be distributed (Hudson, 2003). Research into theories of justice has traditionally been the domain of such disciplines as philosophy, theology, social theory and jurisprudence. This changed in the 1970's when social psychologists recognized that people cared not only about outcomes (distributive justice) but also cared about how decisions were made. The term procedural justice was introduced to describe the fairness of decision-making processes (Lind and Tyler, 1988). Principles of procedural justice include the ability to participate and express voice; impartiality and trustworthiness of decision-making authorities; adequate information; being able to raise issues and have them responded to, and being treated with respect (Tyler, 2000; Lind and Tyler, 1988).

Early research into procedural justice found that fair decision-making processes were perceived as more important than outcomes on the basis that "procedures matter to citizens because fair procedures produce fair outcomes" (MacCoun, 2005:182). Theories that people are more likely to accept decisions that have been made according to the principles of procedural justice have been confirmed in practice (Syme and Nancarrow, 2005). This is in contrast to the still commonly held notion that people are more concerned with outcomes in order to maximise their own benefit (Tyler, 2000; Syme and Nancarrow, 2005). Tyler and Blader (2000:71) call this "the myth of self-interest" and advocate that "people are less influenced by assessments of outcome favourability than is commonly supposed". People do, however, care about 'outcome

fairness' which is the degree to which an outcome meets some fairness societal standard or norm (Skitka *et al.*, 2003).

Why people care about justice and how people's behaviour is influenced by their thoughts on justice are questions central to social psychology research (Tyler *et al.*, 1997; Ross and Miller, 2002). Many theories and models have been proposed to shed light on these and related questions (see Tyler *et al.*, 1997; Clayton and Opatow, 2003). How personal identity is connected to a person's thoughts and beliefs about justice is one such area. Skitka (2003:288) proposes in her Accessible Identity Model (AIM) that people have three primary layers of identity "the material, social, and personal or moral" and that whether something is seen to be fair or unfair depends on which of these layers is foremost at the time. The material identity concerns family, possessions and wealth. Social identity is concerned with a person's social status in the group or community and personal identity concerns moral values and beliefs. The AIM model suggests that people will engage in thoughts about justice if any of these three areas are threatened. The AIM model can also apply to a group's perspective of justice and a group can engage in issues of justice at a material, social or moral value level (Skitka and Bravo, 2005).

The importance of social identity in determining why and when people care about justice is reinforced by Clayton and Opatow (2003) who suggest that justice and identity are inextricably interconnected and that justice must be contextualised. Platow *et al* (2003:267) discuss the importance of a shared social identity within a group value model and argue that "shared social identity is the basis of fairness motivation".

Lupfer *et al* (2000:406) review research into how people experience fairness and comment on the relatively scant research on "the actual experiences of people undergoing just or unjust events". Their own research into how people experience fairness in everyday events supports the distributive and procedural concepts of justice developed by justice researchers and suggests that people react more strongly to unfair than fair events (Lupfer *et al.*, 2000).

This is a brief review of some aspects of a complex still-evolving research area. Two key considerations emerge. The first is that the fairness of procedures and outcomes do matter but outcome favourability and self-interest must also be considered. The second key point is that understanding the context in addition to individual and group perspectives is necessary to understand how people become engaged in, and react to, issues of justice.

2.4 The empirical analytical framework

The empirical analytical framework, outlined in Box 1, consists of two sections: a contextual background and a set of semi-structured interview questions. The interview questions draw on the constructs outlined above, particularly Skitka's (2003) AIM model and the principles of procedural justice. The questions are designed to sequentially draw out interviewees' perceptions of the conflict, starting with abstract notions of justice and fairness, progressing through the individual elements of the decision-making process, and finally to evaluating the overall process and outcome in terms of fairness and justice.

Box 1 The empirical analytical framework

	SECTION	CONTENTS
1	CASE STUDY CONTEXT	Historical perspective, biophysical factors, social context and institutional arrangements
2	INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	
	Background information and context	Occupation, connection with area, position in community, membership of groups and activities related to institutions or groups
	Concepts of fairness and justice	Understanding of the terms fairness and justice external to context
	Understanding cause of issue and involvement	Awareness of the issue, what is at the heart of the issue, attendance at protest
	Level of interest in issue and reasons for interest Adapted from the AIM model (Skitka, 2003).	Exploring how the issue affects the individual and/or group in terms of material, social and personal. Ranking on scale of 0 to 5 for each area
	Level of understanding of institutional arrangements relating to the issue	Exploring how well informed people think they are about water allocation, where they get the information, and how satisfactory it is
	Elements of process (Based on procedural justice principles described in Section 2.3)	Exploring experience and perceptions of events as the issue unfolded: notification, information, opportunity for participation and voice, opportunity for concerns and issues to be raised and responded to, respectful treatment and level of trust in decision-making authority
	Fairness and justice evaluation of process and outcome	Exploring perceptions of fairness related to how the process was managed and relating concepts of fairness and justice to the overall issue of carry-over water
	Suggestions for improvements	Exploring how the outcome could have been made more acceptable

3. The case study: irrigation in a dry country**3.1 An extraordinary drought brings tensions to the surface**

It is well known that Australia is the planet's driest, inhabited continent. Less well-understood until recent years is the extreme variability of Australia's rainfall, particularly in the southern half of the continent. But low rainfall in the last six years culminating in an exceptionally dry year in 2006 has brought the water crisis to the forefront of the nation's consciousness (Mitchell and Wahlquist, 2006). The crisis has stimulated a multifaceted and complicated debate. Topics range from proposed solutions to the shortage of water for cities to how water should be used and what mechanisms are most appropriate to achieve desired outcomes. Also within the debate are concerns about the critical state of many of Australia's river systems and wetlands resulting from water diverted away from natural channel flows to storages for human use. The 2500 kilometre long River Murray is one such river system which has attained national iconic status. Marking the border between the states of New South Wales (NSW) and Victoria,

the River Murray originates in the Snowy Mountains in south-eastern Australia and flows north-westwards to the border of South Australia before turning south to reach the Southern Ocean. With its highly regulated system of water storages, weirs, and barrages the River Murray has become a focal point for the tension between water for the natural environment and water for irrigated agriculture and townships along its river banks (Blackmore, 2002).

One aspect of this tension broke the surface on December 15, 2006 in Deniliquin, NSW. Over 2000 members of the community took to the streets of this small rural town of 8500. They were protesting against recent government actions in October and November to cut part of their water allocation without offering compensation. "Water thieves leave farmers parched" was the headline used by a major metropolitan newspaper (Lewis, 2006). The article described how irrigation farmers perceived this action as a property violation equivalent to outright theft (Lewis, 2006). This article provided sufficient detail for the protest to be chosen as the case study for this research.

3.2 Water in Australia: history and myths

Since European settlers arrived in Australia in the late 1700's the availability of water for towns, agriculture and industry has been a continuing and predominant concern. Factors that have shaped the water history of the country include socio-political interests and boundaries, the political economy, geography, climate and, not least, the prevailing attitudes, aspirations and needs of the times (Smith, 1998; Powell, 1989). Three main phases of water development are generally recognized (Smith, 1998; Blackmore, 2002), but the lines between these are blurred.

In the first phase pioneering European settlers set about finding and using water for domestic sanitation purposes and developing their livelihoods. A major drought from 1877 to 1881 in Victoria put water provision on the political agenda. Towards the end of this first phase, in the 1880s and 90s, the first large water infrastructure projects had been launched and the first water legislation in Australia had been enacted (Smith, 1998).

In the second phase economic development was the driver for large-scale public works such as storage dams and irrigation infrastructure. But tensions emerged between the three states sharing the water of the River Murray. South Australia viewed the river as an important navigation system for river trade. In NSW and Victoria irrigation industries were expanding (Clark, 2002). Increasing the rural population had become a goal of the irrigation agencies and the term 'closer settlement' was used to describe the desired type of farming which would depend totally on irrigation (Smith, 1998).

The second phase of infrastructure development continued until well into the second half of the 20th century. The 19th century aspirations, now seen by many as myths, of 'making the desert bloom' by using 'waters which now run to waste' was a primary motivation for the most ambitious infrastructure project of all—the Snowy Mountains Scheme. Waters of the great Snowy River could be diverted west to the dry inland to be put to productive use by irrigators. How this could be achieved was debated from 1885 until 1949 when the final dual-purpose scheme was adopted. The water was to be used both for hydro-electric power generation and for irrigation (Lloyd, 1988). Whether the scheme's primary purpose was irrigation or hydro-electric power generation was an underlying issue (Davidson, 1969) which remains a discussion point to this day. The scheme was completed in 1974 and was an outstanding engineering success.

In the first and second phases of water use in Australia, people were driven by their need to develop their livelihoods and governments were motivated by economic development. But agricultural problems such as erosion, rising water tables and salinity became serious issues. Political boundaries were recognized as a hindrance to effective natural resource management (NRM) and it became clear that a biophysically based catchment management approach for NRM was needed (Blackmore, 2002).

The third phase, still current, can be regarded as a response to the problems created in the first two phases (Blackmore, 2002). The Murray-Darling Basin Committee, established in 1987, put a cap on water diversion in 1995 (Dole, 2002). The 2004 National Water Initiative (NWI), sets out a comprehensive national water reform process. Key elements of the NWI include identification of over-allocated water systems and restoring those systems to sustainable levels, modifications to the water access entitlements to increase confidence in water property rights and expanding water trade to encourage water to be used for the highest economic return (National Water Commission, 2007:1).

3.3 Development of the Murray Irrigation District in NSW

In 1912 NSW formalised water rights for private irrigators and established the basis for joint water supply schemes and the development of government-owned irrigation districts and areas (Martin, 2005). The Murray Irrigation District, in which the town of Deniliquin is located, was developed over a 25 year period starting in 1933. Initially water for this irrigation district was to be used to drought proof dryland pastoral farms and not for the intensive style of irrigation used in the closer-settlement areas in other river valleys (Martin, 2005). But this changed as the irrigation industry developed in response to economic growth and as new crops, such as rice, were introduced. Rice was found to be highly profitable and production increased dramatically as irrigators subdivided their land to gain increased water allocation per farm (Martin, 2005). This period was characterised by intense interactions between irrigators and the government regarding irrigation practices and water allocation (Martin, 2005).

3.4 Water allocation and carry-over water in NSW

The current water allocation system in NSW recognizes different water entitlements according to the level of security of the supply. The two main categories are high security (for towns, stock and domestic supplies and irrigation of permanent plantings) and general security water (for annual crops and pasture). An annual allocation process determines how much water is available in each of these categories according to the volume of water calculated to be available in the River Murray system. In NSW the allocation policy is to maximise the water available to irrigators each year, leaving minimum water reserves for the following year (DNR, 2006). A risk management tool was introduced in 1998 which enabled irrigators to carry over up to 50 percent of water from one year to the next (Martin, 2005). This carry-over water is central to the case study. The hierarchy reflecting the allocation priority set out by the government is that carry-over water from the previous year is higher than high security entitlements which in turn are higher than general security entitlements (DNR, 2006). This is on the rationale that carry-over water is "an unused allocation from the previous year" (DNR, 2006:20). Irrigators are also able to purchase additional water from other irrigators through a trading scheme.

3.5 The case study: an irrigation community protests

The town of Deniliquin was first settled in 1845 on the Edward River, an anabranch of the River Murray. From its early origins as a river crossing point and wool growing region Deniliquin has become a prosperous rural town servicing the Murray Irrigation District.

How water is allocated in NSW is described in Section 3.4, which includes an explanation of carry-over water and its purpose. There are two key points to note about carry-over water relevant to this case study. First, it is a risk-management tool introduced by the government by which farmers could manage their water allocations between seasons and spread the risk of a dry year. Second, in the hierarchy of allocation of water, carry-over water is deemed to be higher than high security water, because it is sourced from the previous year's water allocation (DNR, 2006).

In the allocation year of 2006-07 the overall water allocation was announced according to procedure in July 2006: 97% for high security and 0% for general security. On October 15, 2006, the irrigation community received notice through a government media release that cutbacks to the current water allocation would take place immediately (DNR, 2006b). This came without prior warning and surprised the community. On November 10, 2006, a second cut back was announced. The first cutback reduced the allocation by 20% and the second cutback by 32%. The cutbacks applied to carry-over water and water that had been purchased through the water trading scheme. The second announcement was preceded by discussions between organizations involved in the irrigation industry and government agencies (MIL, 2006). The cutbacks caused great concern to the irrigation community. A protest was held on December 15, 2006, at which irrigation and community group representatives made statements to the gathering. No compensation for the reduction in water allocation was offered by the government. However, subsequent to the protest, an extraordinary assistance package was announced in which farmers could receive financial assistance if they could demonstrate hardship.

3.6 The fieldwork

The fieldwork was carried out in two stages. In the first stage 12 interviews were conducted in the Deniliquin area of NSW between January 23 and January 30, 2007. The questionnaire was then modified slightly to simplify some questions. The second stage of interviews was carried out in the same area between February 14 and February 26, 2007. A total of 43 interviews were conducted. Interviewees were selected using the snowball or networking method (Ritchie *et al.*, 2003) whereby each was asked to nominate people that they thought could represent different perspectives (such as irrigators, business people, conservationists, agency representatives) within the community. Interviewees were provided with an information sheet on the research and were asked to sign a consent form. Interviewees were also advised of the confidential nature of the research and that any publications would exclude identifying information. During the interviewing process stakeholder groupings were identified and interviewees were selected from these groupings to gain as full a range of perspectives as possible.

The interviews were recorded and a high-level analysis from fieldwork notes was carried out. Preliminary findings from this research, representing a subset of the data, are presented in this paper. The full data set will be transcribed, coded and analysed before the complete findings of the case study research are presented.

4. Perspectives from an irrigation community

As noted in Section 3.6, this is still a research in process. These findings are a high level limited subset of the full case study data. All material in quotations is drawn directly from the interview data.

4.1 How people defined fairness and justice

Defining the terms fairness and justice did not come easily to most people interviewed and this question caused many to reflect for a few moments before answering. The overall impression gained from the research is that people found it difficult to define the terms and differentiate between them. Many people described fairness as the day-to-day way of treating people fairly, for example, that "everybody gets a fair go", "doing the right thing" and "that people treat each other as they would like to be treated". Many people thought that justice has more to do with the legal system such as "I think of lawyers and the law" and that "justice is done where a wrong is righted". There was some degree of scepticism about justice, with one person saying that justice depends on "how much money you've got and whether you can afford barristers" and another saying that both justice and fairness "depend which side of the fence you are sitting on". One person said that he had a strong sense of injustice and did not like to see injustice take place. This person described fairness and justice as being close in their definition, with fair being "a little more flexible" and "in justice I need to know the facts".

4.2 What was at the heart of the protest?

For most people interviewed the fundamental issue was that this water, considered to be equivalent to a property right, had been taken away by government action with no prior warning and with no compensation. One person described it as "a third-party had come into your territory and taken away your right, without any discussion or warning, so the heart of it is that it brings into question what it means to have a right". Some interviewees, who were not in favour of irrigation in general, also considered this to be an unfair action which "could have been handled better". Many members of the community, who were not directly affected by the action, were supportive of the protest because they disagreed with *the way* this action had been done, not *why* it was done. One person said "if there is no water there is no water but don't take it away from us like they did and then ignore us... this could push people over the edge". Another person said that she disagreed with the action because farmers had shown responsible farming practice and had been trying to work with the government and accept changes, and then the action by the government was taken with "no consultation and no real recognition of impact" and that "governments don't behave in a way that shows that they have considered the impact of their decisions". Many people, including community leaders, expressed strong views using such words as "it is a gross injustice" and "it was disgraceful" and "the action was tantamount to theft" and "decision-makers have completely stuffed this up" and "farmers have been crucified".

4.3 Effect on individuals and the community

There was a wide range of perspectives on how the carry-over water issue had affected individuals and the community. Those who had been directly impacted by the water reductions (and had either lost carry-over water or water that they had purchased) had the most material impact and described the financial impact on their farming business. Some farmers had planted crops in anticipation of receiving the water, and now had to face seeing the investment of seed and land preparation go to waste. Most farmers talked about how they had adapted to the new situation by altering some aspect of their operation but were frustrated with the lack of warning or consultation by the decision-

making authority. One farmer said that he "agonised" over decisions and that "it knocks you around with your thinking" when faced with changing situations.

The social and personal impacts on individuals and the community were as much discussed as the material impacts. People were concerned about the level of individual suffering with some farmers being so badly affected that their livelihood was in jeopardy. Some talked about the extent of depression and risk of suicide in the rural areas. Several community leaders interviewed were concerned with the longer term "demoralising" and "destabilising" effect that the decision would have on the community. One person explained what he meant by "destabilising" as "what underpins communities is the ability to be optimistic about the future and invest in the future ... those actions have undermined this ability". One person thought that young farmers would opt to leave the area for work in a town rather than take over the family farm, "why would they want to get into farming when this sort of thing can take place?" Many people reflected that their own personal values had been affected by the water cut backs, and some commented on the personal strain on relationships that would emerge as a result of this decision.

4.4 Fairness and justice in relation to the carry-over water issue

While many interviewees found it difficult to define the terms fairness and justice at the start of the interview, there was little difficulty in relating these terms in the context of the carry-over water issue. People generally had very strong opinions about the unfairness of the outcome, particularly since the carry-over water mechanism was seen as a tool promoted by the government for farmers to use to manage their operations through the drought. For the government to "change the rules" and take away a part of this mechanism was seen to be unjust primarily because carry-over water and purchased water were perceived as belonging to the individual irrigator. The extraordinary assistance package offered by the government was seen to be "tokenism" which did not have "fairness at the root". One person suggested that information was the key to justice and fairness and that too much "disinformation" had been perpetuated and that "both sides have handled it poorly". The risk should have been stated earlier and irrigators should not have been allowed to think it was "water in the water bank".

People also had strong views that *the way* they had been treated was not fair and unjust, "we know the rules -- that's fair. But to be treated like this, that's not fair. The way we've been treated is unjust -- no justice at all". Many people thought that the government had the information and should have known earlier about the shortage of water. In this case they could have warned the community that cuts needed to take place. This would have been seen as fair by many, because they would have been able to make decisions about how they would use less water much earlier in the season. The majority of interviewees felt that the decision-making agency had not treated the farmers or the community with respect during the process.

5. Discussion

5.1 First research aim: understanding complex social problems

The preliminary findings described in Section 4 reveal a rich data set which can be further analysed to gain an in-depth understanding of the Deniliquin protest and water carry-over issue. From this preliminary analysis three key findings emerge. First, irrigation farmers were protesting about a perceived property right being taken away from them without adequate recognition or compensation. This was seen as the central issue. Second, an underlying reason for members of the general community to attend the

protest was a sense of unfairness in the way the irrigation community had been treated, and to show their support. Third, not everyone in the community agreed about the fundamental issue and some expressed different perspectives about water allocation and the irrigation community reaction. The research approach has enabled some emerging themes to be revealed (Box 2), not only about the water carry-over issue, but also about other social and livelihood beliefs and concerns held by community members.

Box 2. Emerging themes from the research

	ACTIONS BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
1	Agencies can change the rules without informing stakeholders
2	Agencies are not concerned with the impact of their actions on communities
3	Agencies are not required to share information with stakeholders
	EFFECT ON COMMUNITY
1	Community groups give voice to concerns
3	Community concerns about livelihoods, mental health and depression
4	Sense of betrayal within community - irrigators believed they were working with the government to manage their risk during drought
5	Local knowledge not valued
6	Lack of information on water reform and many diverging views retained
	SOCIETAL TENSIONS
1	Between government and irrigators: latter do not feel respected or valued
2	Between urban and rural society: declining interactions between towns and country and irrigators do not feel valued as producers of food
3	Between use of water for power production (Snowy Hydro) and for irrigation
4	Between water for environmental flows and water for irrigation during drought
5	Between upper river users and lower river users (interstate)
6	Between irrigator community and conservationists

5.2 Second research aim: use of the empirical analytical framework

The framework proved valuable in two main ways. First, in gathering contextual information, particularly during the background section of the interviews where some people described the several "hats" they wore in the community and their activities related to these group memberships. Second, in structuring the interview such that people gradually became engaged in thinking about fairness and justice, and were able to answer questions in their own way without being specifically asked if an element was fair or not. In the second section of the interview, defining fairness and justice, people frequently took a long pause as they searched for ways to express their thoughts. The questions relating to awareness, involvement and how the issue affected people provided categories and enabled interviewees to provide more specific responses across a wider range than they might otherwise have thought of at the time.

The findings from this research clearly support the use of such a tool which draws upon theoretical constructs from the justice and social psychology literature. This first use of the tool can be considered exploratory and no doubt improvements can be made. For example, Mikula (2005) argues for greater conceptual clarity in distinguishing between measures of justice and suggests that there are direct and indirect measures. However, this research has already shown that the use of a framework containing theoretical constructs can add structure to a qualitative research process.

5.3 Third research aim: contribution to justice research

Returning now to the adaptive theory which underpins this research approach (Layder, 1998). While it would be pre-emptive of the full data analysis to provide concrete suggestions as to the contribution of this empirical research, it is also clear that there are many meeting points and connections which can be made between the numerous theoretical concepts presented in the literature and the rich data gathered in this research. A first round of abstractions from the findings can be identified as follows:

- Although people found it difficult to define fairness and justice in abstract, they had no difficulty in applying these terms in practice (generally using these terms interchangeably)
- People talked more about the injustice of the outcome, less so about the injustice or unfairness of the process
- People recognized the exceptional circumstances of the drought and that the rules needed to change, but this did not lessen the injustice of the outcome
- Some people believed in the overall notion of justice and related this to the issue whereas others were sceptical about whether justice exists
- People described the powerful social, personal and material effect of the issue on individuals and the community
- People were concerned about the way they were treated and this in turn had a reflection on the degree to which they felt valued

6. Conclusions

These preliminary findings give a strong indication that this research can contribute to knowledge about how people understand the notion of justice and how they experience injustice in real-life. Taking one example, as outlined in Box 2, it was clear that many of the perceptions of injustice were related to actions taken by government agencies. These findings could be explored within the context of the attribution-of-blame model developed by Mikula (1993). This model outlines five elements which can contribute to a perception of injustice. First if there is a violation of entitlement; second, if this is caused by another agent; third, if the agent had control over the action; fourth, if the action was intentional, and fifth, if the action was not perceived to be justified (Mikula, 1993:229). At first glance, this model could have some application to these empirical findings.

Returning to the broader context—the challenge of how we allocate scarce resources within a framework of decision-making that is perceived as fair. This research reveals community perspectives on justice in an unfair context. The knowledge gained as a result of the unjust experience should prove valuable to those seeking to include principles of equity and fairness into decision-making processes. If this is done adequately then communities should no longer feel the need to come out onto the streets in protest.

Acknowledgements

I thank the people of the Deniliquin area for their openness and thoughtful perceptions on fairness and justice. Thanks also to Val Brown, Steve Dovers and David Dumaresq of the Australian National University for their valued guidance. The research was funded by a Land & Water Australia scholarship.

References

- Berkes, F. and Folke, C., 1998. Linking social and ecological systems for resilience and sustainability, In *Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms for Building Resilience* (Eds, Berkes, F. and Folke, C.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Biermann, F., 2007. 'Earth system governance' as a crosscutting theme of global change research. *Global Environmental Change* (2007), doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.11.010
- Blackmore, D., 2002. Protecting the future In *Uncharted Waters* (Ed, Connell, D.) Murray-Darling Basin Commission Canberra, pp. 1-8.
- Braud, W. and Anderson, R., 1998. *Transpersonal Research Methods for the Social Sciences: Honoring Human Experience*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Brown, V. A., in press. *Leonardo's vision: a guide to collective thinking and action*, SENSE publishers, Rotterdam.
- Clark, S. D., 2002. Divided power, co-operative solutions? In *Uncharted Waters* (Ed, Connell, D.) Murray-Darling Basin Commission, Canberra, pp. 9-21.
- Clayton, S. and Opatow, S., 2003. Justice and Identity: Changing Perspectives on What Is Fair, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4): 298-310.
- Cullen, P., 2002. The common good, In *Uncharted Waters* (Ed, Connell, D.) Murray-Darling Basin Commission, Canberra, pp. 49-60.
- Davidson, B. R., 1969. *Australia Wet or Dry? The Physical and Economic Limits to the Expansion of Irrigation*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Department of Natural Resources (DNR) 2006, *Background to water management in the NSW Murray and lower Murray-Darling river systems*. NSW Department of Natural Resources.
- Department of Natural Resources (DNR) 2006b. Murray Allocations and Suspension of Trade, Available from: <http://www.dnr.nsw.gov.au/mediarelnr/>, (accessed April 24, 2007)
- Dole, D., 2002. Managers for all seasons, In *Uncharted Waters* (Ed, Connell, D.) Murray-Darling Basin Commission, Canberra, pp. 23-35.
- Dovers, S., 2005. Clarifying the Imperative of Integration Research For Sustainable Environmental Management, *Journal of Research Practice*, 1(2).
- Gross, C., 2007. Community perspectives of wind energy in Australia: The application of a justice and community fairness framework to increase social acceptance, *Energy Policy*, 35(5): 2727-2736.
- Hudson, B., 2003. *Justice in the Risk Society: Challenging and Re-affirming Justice in Late Modernity*, Sage Publications, London.
- Hussey, K., 2007. Recognizing and reconciling social equity issues in contemporary water policy, In *Dry Water* (Eds, Grafton, Q., Bennett, J. and Hussey, K.) Crawford School of Economics and Government, ANU College of Asia & the Pacific, Canberra, pp. 8-11.
- Layder, D., 1998. *Sociological Practice: Linking Theory and Social Research*, Sage Publications, London.
- Lewis, D., 2006. Water thieves leave farmers parched. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 16-17 December 2006.
- Lewis, J., 2003. Design Issues, In *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 47-76.
- Lind, A. E. and Tyler, T. R., 1988. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*, Plenum Press, New York.

- Lloyd, C. J., 1988. *Either Drought or Plenty: Water Development and Management in New South Wales*, Department of Water Resources New South Wales, Parramatta, NSW.
- Lupfer, M. B., Weeks, K. P., Doan, K. A. and Houston, D., 2000. Folk conceptions of fairness and unfairness, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **30**: 405-428.
- MacCoun, R. J., 2005. VOICE, CONTROL, AND BELONGING: The Double-Edged Sword of Procedural Fairness, *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, **1**(1): 171-201.
- Martin, W., 2005. *Water Policy History on the Murray River: A Handbook for Murray Irrigators*, Southern Riverina Irrigators, Deniliquin, NSW.
- Mikula, G., 1993. On the Experience of Injustice, *European Review of Social Psychology*, **4**(1): 223 - 244.
- Mikula, G., 2005. Some Observations and Critical Thoughts about the Present State of Justice Theory and Research, In *What Motivates Fairness in Organisations?*(Ed, Gilliland, S.) Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, Conn., pp. 197-210.
- Mitchell, S. and Wahlquist, A. (2006) When all the rivers run dry, *The Australian*. 14 October 2006.
- Murray Irrigation Limited (MIL), 2006. *Drought update: Government reduces water by 32%, 10 November, 2006.*
Available at: <http://www.murrayirrigation.com.au/files/3290746.pdf> (accessed May 4, 2007)
- National Water Commission, 2007. *National Water Initiative*, Available at: <http://www.nwc.gov.au/nwi/index.cfm#overview> (accessed April 9, 2007).
- Platow, M. J., Wenzel, M. and Nolan, M., 2003. The Importance of Social Identity and Self-Categorisation Processes for Creating and Responding to Fairness, In *Social Identity at Work: Developing Theory for Organisational Practice* (Eds, Haslam, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., Platow, M. and Ellemers, N.) Psychology Press, New York, pp. 261-276.
- Pohl, C., 2005. Transdisciplinary collaboration in environmental research, *Futures*, **37**(10): 1159-1178.
- Powell, J. M., 1989. *Watering the Garden State: Water, Land and Community in Victoria 1834-1988*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J. and Elam, G., 2003. Designing and Selecting Samples, In *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* (Eds, Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J.) Sage Publications, London, pp. 77-108.
- Ross, M. and Miller, D. T. (Eds.), 2002. *The Justice Motive in Everyday Life*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schofield, N., Burt, A. and Connell, D., 2003. *Environmental water allocation: principles, policies and practices*, Canberra, Land & Water Australia.
- Skitka, L. J., 2003. Of Different Minds: An Accessible Identity Model of Justice Reasoning, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, **7**(4): 286-297.
- Skitka, L. J. and Bravo, J., 2005. An Accessible Identity Approach to Understanding Fairness in Organisational Settings In *What Motivates Fairness in Organisations?*(Eds, van den Bos, K., Steiner, D., Skarlicki, D. and Gilliland, S.) Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, CT, pp. 105-128.
- Skitka, L. J., Winquist, J. and Hutchinson, S., 2003. Are Outcome Fairness and Outcome Favourability Distinguishable Psychological Constructs? A Meta-Analytic Review *Social Justice Research*, **16**(4): 309-341.
- Smith, D. I., 1998. *Water in Australia: Resources and Management*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- Syme, G. and Nancarrow, B., 2005. Creating Community Consent through Fairness Judgements In *Consent and Consensus: Politics, Media and Governance In Twentieth Century Australia* (Eds, Cryle, D. and Hillier, J.) API Network, Perth.
- Tyler, R. T., 2000. Social Justice: Outcome and Procedure, *International Journal of Psychology*, **35**(2): 117-125.
- Tyler, R. T. and Blader, S. L., 2000. *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement* Psychology Press, Philadelphia.

- Tyler, R. T., Boeckmann, R. J., Smith, H. J. and Huo, Y. J., 1997. *Social Justice in the Diverse Society*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- Wickson, F., Carew, A. L. and Russell, A. W., 2006. Transdisciplinary research: characteristics, quandaries and quality, *Futures*, **38**: 1046-1059.
- Yin, R. K., 2003. *Case Study Research*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.